

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

3-3-2003

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 3, 2003

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2003). Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 3, 2003. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/304

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Faculty Senate

March 3, 2003
2:30 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes for February 3, 2003** (Attachment H)
Located @ (<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/minutes/Feb3SenMin.html>)
3. **Report of the University President or Chief Academic Officer**
4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee:** James Sayer
5. **Written Committee Reports and Attendance** (Attachment A)
 - A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer
 - B. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres
 - C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
 - D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon
 - E. Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen
 - F. Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham
 - G. Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin
6. **Council Reports** (Attachment B)
 - A. Graduate Council: Jay Thomas (To be distributed at the meeting.)
 - B. Athletic Council: Drew Pringle
7. **Old Business**
 - A. Commencement Committee Honorary Degrees – Barbara Denison (Attachment C)
 - B. GE Course Additions – Ed Rutter
Area II (Non-Western World) and Area VI (COLA)
CST 242-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Music
CST 243-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Art
RST 271-4 Regional Studies: Africa
Area VI (COLA)
TH 250-4 Script Analysis
 - C. Transfer Module – Ed Rutter
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/wsuge03/senate/tmodule.pdf>)
 - D. CECS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cecs2003.pdf>)
 - E. COLA Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cola2003.pdf>)
 - F. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Certificate Proposal – Tom Sav
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/teflcert.pdf>)
 - G. Minor in Criminal Justice Proposal – Tom Sav
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/justice.pdf>)
 - H. Salary Inequity Appeals Process (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres
(Attachment D)
 - I. Due Process Mechanism (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment E)
 - J. Professional Development Leave (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment F)
8. **New Business** (*A suspension of the rules will be requested to move these items to Old Business.*)
 - A. CONH Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav
(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/conh2003.pdf>)
 - B. COSM Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav

- (Details will be posted February 27 @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cosm2003.pdf>)
- C. CEHS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav
(Details will be posted February 27 @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cehs2003.pdf>)
- D. General Education Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav
Biology 105, 106, 107 Sequence Substitution
Current: BIO 112, 114, 115
New: BIO 111, 112, 115
Music 214 Substitution
Current: MUS 121
New: MUS 121 and 122
- E. Graduate Certificate TEFL – Joe Coleman (Attachment G)

9. Adjournment

- A. Nominations for Faculty President-Elect (2004-05) are currently being accepted through Friday, April 4, 2003. The following is applicable via Provost Memorandum No. 82-3, May 1, 1982.

“The President of the Faculty shall have a two course, or two-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load during the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters of his or her term of office. The President Elect of the Faculty shall have a one course, or one-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load for the Spring Quarter of his or her term of office.”

- B. Next Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, April 7, 2003, 2:30 p.m., 156 Student Union.

Attachment A **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS FACULTY SENATE March 3, 2003**

Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer, Chair

An oral report will be given at Senate.

Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres, Chair

The committee continued its work on the Salary Inequity Appeals Process, Due Process Mechanism, and Professional Development Leave policies and has submitted the revised policies as Old Business for today's meeting.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav, Chair

The UCAPC met on February 10 and due to the volume of curriculum requests before the committee, scheduled (as also required in January) a continuation meeting for February 17. Due to the snow closing, the latter was rescheduled to February 24. As a result, the UCAPC report to the Faculty Senate **will be posted on February 27 at the following link:**

<http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/6fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon, Chair

No report.

Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen, Chair

Information Technology (IT) Committee has decided to conduct a university-wide faculty survey on the University's computing and technology services, and on the University's teaching and learning services. In our last meeting held on Feb. 11, we reviewed a draft copy of the survey developed by Prof. Nieder's group. Basically, the survey consists of questions regarding the utilization, needs and satisfaction in the above areas. There were a number of questions raised by the participants of the committee. A new draft will be discussed at Feb. 25's meeting to finalize the survey.

Library services are not included in the committee's survey because University Library will participate in a more comprehensive library survey called Libqual developed by Association of Research Libraries at Texas A & M University,

through Ohio Library Link. Both IT committee and Library surveys will be conducted in early spring quarter.

Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham, Chair

No report.

Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin, Chair

An oral report will be given at Senate.

Attachment B
COUNCIL REPORTS
FACULTY SENATE
March 3, 2003

Graduate Council – Jay Thomas

To be distributed at the meeting.

Athletic Council – Drew Pringle

The sub-committees of Athletics Council are preparing their annual reports. Senior Vice President and Provost Dr. Perry Moore will come to our April 25th meeting. The NCAA certification process, that occurs every 10 years, is underway. Information on the committee structure and overall plan is posted on the WSU Athletics Department web site. Several members of Athletics Council have active roles in the process. Mark Mamrack is the Senate Representative on the NCAA Certification Steering Committee and questions concerning the process should be directed to him.

Attachment C
Commencement Committee Membership
and
Procedures for Honorary Degree Nominations

Commencement Committee Membership

The Commencement Committee will consist of nine (9) members: six (6) faculty representatives who are appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and three (3) student members who are appointed from among the elected student representatives of the Student Government.

The terms of Commencement Committee members will be as follows:

- Two (2) faculty members will serve three (3) year terms.
 - Two (2) faculty members will serve two (2) year terms.
 - Two (2) faculty members will serve a one (1) year term.
 - Three (3) students will serve a one (1) year term.
- No faculty member may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms.

The chair of the Commencement Committee will be appointed from among the six faculty members by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Procedures for Honorary Degree Nominations

Nominations for honorary degrees will be considered by the Honorary Degrees Committee, a subcommittee of the Commencement Committee. The committee will consist of four (4) faculty members and one (1) student member from the Commencement Committee. The procedure for nominating a candidate for an honorary degree is as follows.

1. Send a request to present a nomination to the committee prior to any nomination. The committee will review the request and determine if a nomination should be reviewed for further consideration. Approval of a request to nominate requires a majority of the committee but does not indicate approval of a subsequent nomination.

A request must be submitted by January 5 for both commencements in the subsequent year. It may be submitted by anyone affiliated with Wright State University (faculty, staff, students, trustees, or alumni) and should consist of a brief letter outlining the contributions of the potential nominee.

The request should remain as confidential as possible. The potential nominee should not be notified of the request, nor should there be any attempt to solicit external support for the request.

2. Nominations may be submitted after a request to nominate has been approved. The deadline for submission of all nominating materials, for both June and December Commencements is March 1.
3. Nominations may be made by anyone affiliated with Wright State University (faculty, staff, students, trustees, or alumni).
4. Nominations must include:
 - A narrative letter, in non-technical language, setting forth the reasons for the nomination.
 - A full resume of the nominee, including accomplishments, honors, education and experience.
 - A minimum of three (3) letters supporting the nomination from persons knowledgeable about the nominee's contributions.
5. A majority vote of the full membership of the committee is necessary to approve a nominee for an honorary degree; that is, five (5) votes will be required for approval.
6. The deliberations of the committee regarding nominees should be strictly confidential.
7. Nominations receiving favorable consideration by the committee will be recommended to the President of the University, who may subsequently recommend them to the Board of Trustees for further consideration and final approval.

2/5/03

Attachment D Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure

(Approved by Academic Council 10/03/94, the General Faculty 11/15/94, and the WSU Board of Trustees 4/14/95)

A. Definition

“Non-bargaining faculty” are defined as fully affiliated faculty who are not represented by a collective bargaining agreement. Non-bargaining faculty salary raises combine across-the-board percent increases with ~~are based primarily upon merit, and to a lesser extent upon market and equity adjustments which should be evaluated annually. and other factors.~~ Research, teaching, and service merits and other relevant factors are assessed at the departmental level by the chair, the departmental faculty development committee (or its equivalent) where procedures have been established to include this committee in the annual evaluative process and , and possibly by extramural reviewers, with the concurrence of the dean or by the Dean in the SOPP and CONH. Deans are responsible for the annual evaluation process for non-bargaining faculty members who are serving as chairs. Differences in raises and in salaries between **non-bargaining** faculty members will inevitably occur. This salary inequity appeals procedure is subject to the university compensation policy as defined in the Board of Trustees' Resolution 94-8 and *The Wright Way: Policies and Procedures* Number 4210. The term “salary inequity” here refers to a perceived inequity in one’s own salary due to the department’s, college’s, or school’s allocation of annual raises over a period at least three years, beginning no more than seven years prior to the filing of a salary inequity appeal.

B. Annual Faculty Evaluation

A performance evaluation will be given to each non-bargaining faculty member annually and a copy placed in the non-bargaining faculty member’s department file. The purpose of this annual evaluation is to ensure the continuous improvement and development of the non-bargaining faculty member and to inform decisions about merit pay, reappointment and promotion. Department chairs/deans shall meet with their non-bargaining faculty individually, to review their progress and its impact on the faculty member’s retention and/or promotion. The non-bargaining faculty member may add personal commentary to these annual performance evaluations and that commentary shall be included in the non-bargaining faculty member’s department file. Non-bargaining faculty who wish to be considered for promotion can request such review in writing to the chair/dean. A written review shall be prepared by the chair/dean and given to the non-bargaining faculty member and placed in the faculty member’s department file.

In the annual evaluation letter (~~Faculty Handbook, Section Two, Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotion and Tenure, VI. H.~~), a

non-bargaining faculty member is informed of any deficiencies so that efforts to improve performance may be initiated. All departments and colleges or schools should have procedures whereby disputes about salaries and raises **by non-bargaining faculty** may be debated objectively and with all due consideration between colleagues. Under most circumstances, merit and other factors relevant to salaries are most accurately assessed at the level of departments and colleges or schools; likewise, it is usually most appropriate that salaries and merit raises be determined at those levels. Hence, this university level salary inequity appeal process is applicable only when appeals at the lower procedural levels (departmental and/or school or college) have not resolved the dispute.

Thus, the procedures and review process (as described in sections **C. and D.** below) are intended, first, to ascertain whether department, school, and college procedures for resolving disputes over a **non-bargaining** faculty member's annual evaluations, raises, and salary have been followed; second, to determine whether a salary inequity exists; and third, to recommend a salary (or salary range) to correct an inequity finding. It is to be emphasized that the findings of this process are not binding. However, in view of the good faith social contract between individual members of the faculty, the faculty governance structure, and the university administration, it is anticipated that the findings of these procedures, whether in favor of the complainant or not, should carry considerable weight with both the complainant and the university administration.

C. Procedures

1. The appropriate academic unit will establish and inform all **non-bargaining** faculty of methods and criteria for evaluating merit. **Non-bargaining faculty members should play a role in establishing these criteria. Criteria that have been established by a department/school/college but not communicated to non-bargaining faculty members before the end of the calendar year prior to the evaluation year cannot be used in determining merit.** ~~In accordance with the university policy (Faculty Handbook, Section Two, Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotion and Tenure, VI. H.)~~ An annual performance evaluation (**See Section B**) will be given to each **non-bargaining** faculty member. This evaluation together with the faculty member's responses to it will be used in deciding merit salary increments and will be kept on permanent file.
2. Each school or college is permitted but not required to establish its own salary inequity appeal procedure. Each school and college must inform its **non-bargaining** faculty whether or not it has its own salary inequity appeal procedure.

When a school or college wishes to establish its own salary inequity appeal procedure, the following rules apply:

- a. The college/school must inform its **non-bargaining** faculty of the rules or bylaws governing the college/school procedure.
- b. The rules or bylaws governing the school/college procedure must include the following provisions:
The final recommendations of the school/college procedure shall be communicated in writing to the complainant, the chair, and the dean, with a copy to the provost. This communication shall occur no later than the end of the academic quarter **or six months** (with the exception of the summer quarter) ~~which~~ **following** receipt of the written complaint by the school/college salary inequity appeal committee (or equivalent body).
3. A **non-bargaining** faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her salary is obligated to seek relief from the department chair and from the dean, and, in colleges/schools which establish a salary inequity appeal procedure, from the college/school procedure. When a complainant has not been able to achieve settlement of the dispute by these mechanisms, the dispute will be reviewed at a meeting between the complainant, the chair, the dean, and the provost.
4. If not settled in 3., and if the complaint involves a charge of discrimination based on race, sex, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation, the complaint will be forwarded by the dean with a cover letter to the university Affirmative Action Office.
5. If not settled in 3., and if 4. does not apply, the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will handle the complaint. The complainant should submit to the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee a document containing:
 - a. A concise statement outlining the complaint, including the grounds on which the complaint is lodged and the years covered by the complaint. (As noted in section A. above, this period must consist of at least three years, and it must begin no more than seven years prior to the date on which the document described in this section B. 5. is submitted by the complainant to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee).
 - b. A clear statement of the relief expected by the complainant.
 - c. Copies of the annual evaluations written by the chair (or chair's equivalent) for the years under consideration, and any responses thereto.
 - d. Any other documentation that may be relevant.
6. Upon receipt of the materials in 5., the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will appoint a 3-person investigation subcommittee consisting of: one member from the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee (to chair the subcommittee); one **non-bargaining** faculty member from the complainant's college or school; one other WSU ~~full-time~~ **non-bargaining** faculty member.

D. Review Process

1. The subcommittee will review the submitted material, acquire additional information for review, and report its findings as delineated below. The subcommittee will observe strictest confidentiality throughout.

2. The review and reporting tasks of the subcommittee will occur in the three stages a., b., and c. shown below.

- a. The subcommittee will determine whether proper procedures have been followed. “Proper procedures” include the following:
 - i. Departmental merit review procedures.
 - ii. Annual evaluation performed for each year of the complaint period as evidenced by the annual evaluation letter and the complainant’s responses.
 - iii. Lower-level (department, college, or school) salary appeal procedures pursued according to their respective guidelines.
 - iv. Meeting between complainant, chair, dean, and provost as specified in C. 3. of this Salary Inequity Appeals ~~section of the University Faculty Constitution and Bylaws.~~

If the subcommittee finds that proper procedures have been followed, or that proper procedures have been followed by the complainant but not by the administration (department, school, college, or university), then the subcommittee’s work will proceed to stage b. below.

If the subcommittee finds that proper procedures have not been followed by the complainant, then the subcommittee will not proceed to stage b. It will instead submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee.

- b. The subcommittee will determine whether a salary inequity exists. For this purpose, the subcommittee shall undertake the following tasks:
 - i. Assess differences in statements found in the annual evaluation letter and the complainant’s responses. Where quantitative differences exist (e.g., ~~the number of papers~~, **scholarship**, teaching evaluation summaries, **service activities**, etc.), the subcommittee will verify the facts.
 - ii. Assess whether any deficiencies defined by the annual evaluation were addressed by the complainant in subsequent years, and whether such changes were noted in subsequent annual evaluations.
 - iii. Verify the complainant’s actual salaries in the complaint period via the annual university budget in the university-archives main library.
 - iv. Seek any additional information needed for the investigation. In particular, the subcommittee may ask the complainant, department chair, dean, provost, and other involved persons to appear and testify; the subcommittee is empowered to examine the complainant’s confidential personnel files relevant to the appeal. Likewise, the complainant, department chair, dean, and provost may choose to meet personally with the subcommittee should any of these persons so desire; it shall be the responsibility of the subcommittee to notify these persons of its investigation and of their right to meet with the subcommittee. (Unavailability of material or information requested from various sources but not submitted within a reasonable time period will be noted in the final report; the final report shall likewise note the refusal of any person who was asked to appear but who did not, or who otherwise failed to reasonably cooperate with the subcommittee’s investigation.)

If the subcommittee finds that a salary inequity exists, then the subcommittee will proceed to stage c.

If the subcommittee finds that no salary inequity exists, then the subcommittee will not proceed to stage c. It will instead submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee.

- c. The subcommittee will determine a dollar amount, or a range of dollar amounts, which would remove the salary inequity. For this purpose, the subcommittee may seek any additional information needed. In particular, if the subcommittee wishes, it may seek information regarding salary levels or faculty productivity at suitably chosen other universities as well as at Wright State, salary statistics from appropriate professional organizations, or other market value estimates; or other information from sources internal or external to Wright State. The solicitation of such information from sources external to the university is made solely in support of the committee’s efforts to determine if a salary inequity exists within the framework of Wright State’s compensation policy. (Unavailability of material or information requested from various sources but not submitted within a reasonable time period will be noted in the final report.)

The subcommittee will submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University Faculty Affairs Committee.

3. The University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will review the subcommittee’s report. The University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will give copies of the subcommittee’s report and the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee’s recommendations (if any) to the complainant, the chair, the dean, the provost, and the university president.
4. The provost will respond to the subcommittee’s report and to the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee’s recommendations (if any) in a written statement to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee and the complainant within thirty days of receipt.

If the subcommittee’s report includes a dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts) as in 2. c. above, *and* the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee does not explicitly recommend against adopting this dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts), and the provost does not accept this dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts), then the provost must meet with the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee to explain the reasons for his/her different conclusions in an attempt to achieve consensus via collegiality. The subcommittee will attend this meeting if either the provost or the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee wishes.

[The university president may, at his/her option, personally fulfill either or both of the duties of the provost listed under this section C. 4.]

E. Appeal

1. A **non-bargaining** faculty member may not re-appeal a decision reached under this Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure. However, the **non-bargaining** faculty member may submit a new appeal for a different (that is, non-overlapping) period of at least three years.
2. An appeal under this process (1-3 above) may not be undertaken at the same time as the complainant is pursuing other methods of appeal external to the procedures defined above.

Attachment E
DUE PROCESS MECHANISM

(Approved by the Board of Trustees May 27, 1981; amended April 24, 1978; November 8, 1979; April 4, 1985; and October 1-2, 1992)

Preamble

The **non-bargaining** faculty and administration of Wright State University agree that this Due Process Mechanism provides an orderly method to secure prompt and equitable disposition of complaints. We agree to use the procedures in good faith whereby **creating** an atmosphere of mutual respect. ~~will exist for each other.~~

Introduction

The procedures presented in this statement are ~~not to be considered~~ **neither** a replacement **for a college's or school's due process** nor for the generally accepted mechanism of administrative review. **Non-bargaining** faculty members are encouraged to discuss issues with appropriate administrative representatives at all levels.

These procedures are ~~also not~~ applicable **at the university level** for cases involving ~~the removal or suspension of tenured faculty or in cases concerning the non-reappointment of non-bargaining nontenured faculty when violations of academic freedom or proper notification of non-reappointment are alleged. Procedures applicable to these circumstances are presently described in sections VII and VIII, respectively, of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure.~~

These procedures are not applicable to cases involving only salary disagreements. **Procedures covering these violations are addressed in the revised Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure.**

The procedures are presented as a mechanism which ~~would~~ allows for the resolution of areas of disagreement with the least disruption to the university.

A. Definitions

1. "Non-bargaining faculty" are defined as fully affiliated faculty who are not represented by a collective bargaining agreement.
2. ~~The term~~ "Complaint" is defined as ~~shall be interpreted to mean~~ an allegation by one or more **non-bargaining** faculty members that there has been a violation, misinterpretation, or misapplication of policies or procedures affecting the conditions of the faculty member's (s') employment, or that such policies or procedures are opposed to the stated aims and goals of the university.
3. The ~~term~~ "complainant" is ~~will stand for~~ the **non-bargaining** faculty member or members initiating a complaint.
4. The ~~term~~ "administration" is ~~stands for~~ the dean or chief academic officer at college/school (hereafter noted as college but meaning college or school) or university level, respectively.
5. The term "hearing board" ~~is stands for~~, at the university level, a five-member committee appointed **when needed** by the **University Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee from ~~the tenured non-bargaining faculty. or comparable fully affiliated senior level faculty from the School of Medicine or the School of Professional Psychology.~~

At the college level, a three-member hearing board will be appointed **when needed** by ~~either: (a) an appropriate elected college committee a college committee that consists of a majority of non-bargaining faculty.~~ The method ~~used to select members of selection~~ will to be determined by the college **non-bargaining** faculty. ~~At both the university and college levels, a standing hearing board shall be appointed each year and shall serve until the new board is appointed.~~ The complainant and the administration may peremptorily challenge the presence of one member of a hearing board. Replacements, if necessary, will be selected in a manner prescribed in **C,2,b. VIII. B. 5. of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure.** The hearing board shall elect their own chair. The hearing board shall have the authority to dismiss nuisance cases following deliberations.

B. Statement of Basic Principles

1. Every **non-bargaining** faculty member or group of **non-bargaining** faculty shall have the right to present complaints in accordance with the procedures described herein. These procedures in no way preclude the faculty member or group from seeking resolution through administrative

review.

2. Publicity shall be avoided during the processing of a complaint, and the parties shall avoid infringement upon the rights of third parties.
3. No one who participates in these procedures shall be subject to discipline or reprisal because of such participation.
4. Administrators have the responsibility to consider and take action promptly, within authority delegated to them, on recommendations presented to them.
5. The failure of an administrator at any level to act and communicate the administrator's decision within the prescribed time limits permits **the non-bargaining** faculty member to proceed to the next stage.
6. ~~There are two levels at which a complaint can be pursued: (1) college, and (2) university.~~ The normal procedure is to attempt to resolve the problem first at **the college** level ~~1~~, and then at **the university** level ~~2~~. However, when the complaint originates at an administrative level higher than the college, the **non-bargaining** faculty member shall start the procedure at that level. If the complainant has filed the same or substantially similar complaint in an external state or federal agency or court, the college or university hearing board shall not consider that complaint unless the complaint is remanded to the appropriate hearing board by the external agency or court. Judgment as to what constitutes "the same or substantially similar complaint" rests with the college or university hearing board, as appropriate. Upon request of the college or university hearing board, the administration shall inform the hearing board in writing of each complaint filed by the complainant in an external state or federal agency or court.
7. At each level every effort shall be made to resolve the problem by discussion.
8. To ensure that the rights of the complainant and of the university are protected, neither party shall ~~ever~~ be denied the right to have counsel present. The complainant may ~~can~~ have a faculty adviser, **of any rank**, present in lieu of counsel.
9. ~~If the complaint involves termination of employment, During the exercise of this procedure,~~ full pay shall be continued **during this procedure** ~~up to the until~~ termination of the complainant's contract.

C. The Due Process Mechanism

The procedures shall consist of discussion and a hearing, in that order. ~~two phases, in the following order: (1) discussion, and (2) a hearing.~~

1. Discussion

The complainant forwards to the administration a written description of the complaint, stipulating:

- a. the grounds constituting the complaint as defined in paragraph A.
- b. the remedy requested
- c. that this complaint is submitted pursuant to the Due Process Mechanism.

The complainant and the administration shall meet to discuss the problem and to attempt to reach an acceptable solution. This discussion is informal and cannot be used later as evidence. The administration shall communicate its decision in writing to the complainant within five business days of the completion of discussion.

2. ~~A~~ Hearing Procedures

A request for a complaint hearing can be filed within five business days with the administration, if the aggrieved is dissatisfied with the administrative decisions at the college ~~or university~~-level and the aggrieved is convinced that further discussion will be fruitless ~~at that level—a request for a complaint hearing can be filed, with the administration, within five business days. A hearing can be requested at either the college or university level, but in no case can the complainant request more than one hearing on a specific complaint.~~

~~If in case a hearing is requested, at either the college or university level, the following will prevail unless a college/school has developed its own procedures at that level. procedure outlined in VIII. B. 4. through 12. of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure shall be followed.~~

- a. **Both the non-bargaining faculty member or members (complainant party) alleging the violation and those alleged to have committed or assisted in it (hereafter Referred to as respondent party) have the right to be represented at the hearing; to be represented by counsel; to produce witnesses, statements, or other evidence; and to cross-examine positions.**
- b. **Within ten days of the filing of the complaint, the complainant party alleging the violation and the respondent party may each challenge one member of the original hearing board peremptorily, and the individual challenged shall not serve on the board. If the hearing board is constituted after a complaint is filed, the ten-day challenge window opens when the hearing board has been constituted and both the complainant party and the respondent party have been notified of the hearing board's membership. The University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee shall select a substitute member, if required. There shall be no other challenges considered. The procedure for selecting a substitute member is for the two parties (complainant and respondent) each to submit two names who are eligible and willing to serve. The University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee shall submit one name. Each party can then mark off two names. The committee will select the replacement from the remaining name or names.**

- c. All concerned shall be given adequate time to prepare for the hearing, which normally shall be held no earlier than fifteen days after delivery of the allegation to the chair of the hearing board. The principle of confrontation of witnesses and examination of evidence shall apply throughout the hearing. In this regard, both parties should submit the names of first witnesses to be called, a summary of their expected testimony, and a description of any other evidence to be presented. This information should be available to both parties at least ten days before the scheduled hearing.
- d. The complainant has the right to either an open or closed hearing upon the complainant's request, but a majority of the hearing board can close any part of the hearing in which it appears that the evidence presented will adversely affect the personal reputation of third parties, or if becomes difficult to protect the integrity of the proceedings.
- e. The complainant and the respondent parties shall each appoint a single spokesperson responsible for the conduct of the party's case during the hearing.
- f. In order to facilitate completion of the hearing in a manner equitable to both parties, the following operating procedure and time limits are suggested and shall be observed unless either party deems the procedure inappropriate to the case prior to the hearing being held. The chair of the hearing board shall be responsible for holding the time restrictions.
 - i. Time restrictions
 - a. position statement by complainants will be held to a maximum of ten minutes
 - b. position statement by respondents will be held to a maximum of ten minutes
 - c. questions from the hearing board will be held to a maximum of ten minutes
 - ii. Operating Procedures – complainant's witnesses
 - a. Hearing of the complainant's witnesses, called by the spokesperson. Each witness will have 15 minutes maximum for cross examination by respondent, plus five minutes maximum for cross examination by the hearing board.
 - b. After all witnesses have been called by the complainant for first testimony, any witness can be recalled by either the complainant party, the respondent party, or the hearing board, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
 - c. Maximum total time for complainant's witnesses, including recalled witnesses, shall be no more than two and one-half hours.
 - iii. Operating procedures – respondent's witnesses
 - a. Hearing of respondent's witnesses, called by the spokesperson. Each witness shall have 15 minutes maximum per testimony, plus ten minutes maximum for cross examination by complainant party, plus five minutes maximum for cross-examination by the hearing board.
 - b. After all witnesses have been called by the respondent for a first testimony, any witnesses can be recalled by either, the respondent, the complainant, or the hearing board, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
 - c. Maximum total time for respondent's witnesses, including recalled witnesses, shall be no more than two and one-half hours.
 - iv. Operating Procedures – board's witnesses
 - a. Hearing of the board's witnesses. Each witness shall have ten minutes maximum per testimony, plus five minutes maximum for cross-examination by complainants, plus five minutes maximum for cross examination by respondent.
 - b. After all witnesses have been called by the hearing board for a first testimony, any witness can be recalled by either the hearing board, the complainant, or the respondent, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
 - c. Maximum total time for hearing board witnesses, including recalled witnesses shall be no more than one hour.
 - v. Summary statements by the complainant's spokesperson, the respondent's spokesperson and the hearing board shall be ten minutes maximum for each party.
- g. At any time during the hearing, the hearing board may vote to extend any of the above time limits.
- h. At an appropriate time during the hearing, the hearing board may declare one recess for no longer than one hour. In addition, the hearing board can declare a break, no longer than two hours, for a meal if required.
- i. A recording of the proceedings shall be made and preserved until the complaint has been settled, and a typed summary of the proceedings shall be sent to every member involved in the complaint. The recording (or minutes if no recording is made) shall be available to all concerned parties. Should the complainant not wish to have the proceedings recorded, the board shall keep detailed minutes of the hearing.
- j. The hearing board shall deliberate promptly and send its recommendations to both the administration (to the college, if a college hearing; otherwise, to the university) and the complainant simultaneously within sixty calendar days from the date the request for a

hearing was filed with two exceptions: First, if the complaint is filed between sixty days before the end of the spring term and the first day of the fall term, the case will be considered when the fall term commences; however, if the hearing board, the complainant, and the respondent all agree, the case may be considered before the beginning of the fall term. Second, breaks between terms within the academic year extend the sixty day deadline by a like number of days. The administration shall communicate its decision to the complainant within ten business days of receipt of the board's recommendation.

- k. After the hearing is ended, the hearing board shall make a finding with recommendations, and it shall be delivered in writing to the university president and every member involved in the complainant process. The university president shall have thirty days to accept or reject the findings.
- l. The non bargaining faculty member alleging the violation can appeal the findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees within thirty days after receiving the university president's decision.

3. Continuation of Procedure

If the complainant is dissatisfied with the college administration's decision following a hearing, the complainant may request continuation at the university level by initiating a discussion ~~phase 1 (discussion)~~ with the chief academic officer. An appeal of the administration's decision to the university hearing board may follow in accordance with ~~paragraph 2: hearing procedure~~ above. ~~but if a college hearing has already been held, the university hearing board shall not be required to conduct another.~~

4. Qualifications

If the complainant and the administration at any level agree that it is in the best interest of the university to ensure that a complaint should not proceed beyond that level and it is determined that the authority to deal with the matter lies at the respective ~~that~~ level, then they can agree to have the hearing board serve as a board of binding arbitration.

If the administration and the complainant agree, then the above procedure ~~may can~~ be altered to fit certain unusual circumstances.

Attachment F

Professional Development Leave

(Approved by the Board of Trustees June 8, 1977; Revised June 5, 1985 and December 1, 1988)

A. Purpose: The enactment of Section 3345.28 of the Ohio Revised Code authorizes the Wright State University Board of Trustees to approve the establishment of a faculty improvement program. At Wright State University this is administered as a professional leave program for full-time faculty. The purpose of the professional leave program is to advance the academic competence of **non-bargaining** faculty members and to enhance their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars. Professional leave is a privilege gained by **the number of years of** service to the university.

B. Definitions:

- 1. "Academic years of teaching service," as used in this policy, means a period of time during which **non-bargaining** faculty members are employed at Wright State University. Each such year consists of ~~one of the following:~~ **a: at** least three of four consecutive quarters of an academic year beginning with the fall term of one calendar year and ending with the summer term of the following calendar year.
- ~~b. For those non-bargaining faculty employed prior to September 1968, at least two of three consecutive trimesters beginning with the fall term of one calendar year and ending with the summer term of the following calendar year.~~
-
- 2. "Full-time **Non-bargaining** faculty" member" means faculty members who are ~~will be~~ defined as **fully affiliated** ~~that~~ faculty who are fully affiliated with Wright State University, **not represented by a collective bargaining agreement and who are not department chairs.** ~~for purposes of promotion and tenure consideration.~~

C. Program: Professional leaves are granted for planned programs of education, research, study, creative activity, travel, and other professional undertakings of importance to both the individual and the university. All leave proposals will be evaluated solely on how well they advance the academic competence of faculty members and enhance their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars. Professional leaves cannot be used to work toward a terminal degree.

Subject to legislative restrictions and availability of funds for this purpose, Wright State University offers three plans to its ~~full-time~~ **non-bargaining** faculty for professional leaves with pay.

1. Plan I supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for one quarter **or three months** leave at one hundred percent of **the salary the non-bargaining faculty would have earned during the quarter or three months.**
2. Plan II supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for two quarters **or six months** at eighty-three percent of **the salary the non-bargaining faculty would have received during those two quarters or six months.**
(~~The salary will be calculated on the basis of one quarter at full salary and two quarters at three-fourths salary.~~)
3. Plan III supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for three quarters **or nine months** at seventy-five percent of **the salary the non-bargaining faculty would have earned during the three quarters or nine months.**

These alternatives are made available because the purposes of the professional leave differ, and thus the length of time necessary should be variable. (~~Note: For twelve-month faculty, the salary will be determined from a calculated three-quarter base.~~)

~~Subject to legislative and budgetary restrictions,~~ Each year the university shall provide opportunity for professional leaves for **non-bargaining** faculty up to a number equal to **fifteen** ~~twelve~~ percent (**rounded to the nearest whole percent**) of the eligible ~~full-time~~ **non-bargaining** faculty. ~~of the university.~~ This allocation shall be made by **rank for lecturers and clinical assistant professors, by school for the School of Professional Psychology and by college for the College of Medicine** ~~school or college~~ and shall be adjusted annually. **In addition, no college or school may have more than one lecturer or clinical assistant professor on leave during any one quarter.** In all cases, the final determination of eligibility, allocations, and awards of leave shall be made by the **provost.** ~~president~~

D. Supplement to the Professional Development Leave Program

(Approved by the Board of Trustees June 5, 1985):

A supplemental research/scholarly leave program (PDLP) shall provide qualified **non-bargaining** faculty members with the opportunity to compete for **one quarter/three months or two quarter/six months additional** leave at full salary. ~~for outstanding research/scholarly projects requiring more than one quarter to complete.~~ **The university will provide 15 supplemental quarters of PDL to be awarded on a competitive basis.** ~~The requests for supplemental quarters shall be judged competitively as part of the PDLP approval process.~~ Like the regular professional development leaves, supplemental leaves can also be coupled with extramural funding.

If awarded a Professional Development Leave plus one supplemental quarter, a non-bargaining faculty member's total leave shall consist of two quarters/six months leave at 100% of the salary the non-bargaining faculty member would have earned during those two quarters/six months or three quarters leave at 89% of the salary the non-bargaining faculty member would have earned during those three quarters/nine months.

If awarded a Professional Development leave plus two supplemental quarters/six months, a non-bargaining faculty member's total leave shall consist of three quarters/nine months leave at 100% of the salary the non-bargaining member would have earned during those three quarters/nine months.

Recommendations for supplemental leaves shall be made by the appropriate college or school committee. The final recommendation **to be submitted to the provost** shall be made by either the ~~subset of the~~ **University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee for lecturers and clinical assistant professors or the SOM/SOPP faculty development committee.** ~~Promotion and Tenure Committee comprised of the college and school faculty representatives and the at-large faculty representative.~~

- E. Eligibility: To be eligible **for PDL** an applicant must have seven **continuous years of** ~~academic years of~~ teaching service as a ~~full-time~~ **non-bargaining** faculty member at Wright State University. A **non-bargaining** faculty member who has been granted a professional leave shall complete another seven academic years of teaching service at Wright State University before becoming eligible for another grant of professional leave.
- F. **Procedures:** ~~Conditions:~~ **Non-bargaining** faculty members desiring a professional leave with pay in accordance with the legislation ~~law~~ should submit to the Department chair/dean **by November 1 a leave proposal (5 page limit not**

including any supporting materials) and a current curriculum vitae. ~~for their program through their appropriate academic unit to the university president.~~ The proposal should clearly specify the project planned **including objectives,** ~~the potential for advancing the academic competence of faculty members and enhancing their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars,~~ the number of quarter(s) for which the leave is requested; ~~required for the project,~~ **the need for one or two supplemental quarters, if requested, the expected outcomes,** any extramural funding expected or being solicited, and alternate plans if any requested supplemental monies (internal or external) are not granted.

The department chair/dean will forward all proposals to the appropriate college/school who will make recommendations in accordance with how well the proposal advances the academic competence of non-bargaining faculty members and enhances their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars.

All proposals, the Chair's/Dean's recommendations/rankings and the appropriate college/school committee recommendations/rankings and a statement by the Chair/Dean indicating whether and how adequate coverage can be provided during the Non-bargaining Faculty member's absence shall be forwarded to the Dean, if appropriate.

After reviewing the recommendations, the Deans of the SOM and SOPP will forward their recommendation/rankings to the Provost. The Deans of the other colleges will forward their recommendations/rankings for lecturers/clinical assistant professors in the CONH to the University Non-Bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee. The University Non-bargaining Committee will rank the proposals based on the information received from the Deans. The committee will make every effort to ensure that, as far as merit allows, awards are equitably distributed across the spectrum of programs and departments. The committee will then forward their recommendations to the Provost.

Upon termination of a professional leave, recipients are expected to serve the university for a minimum of one academic year. An individual who elects not to return for the ensuing academic year shall refund to the university an amount equal to the compensation received during the period of professional leave.

By the end of the first academic quarter following their return, the legislation requires faculty members to submit a report of their activities to the college faculty and to the university president.

All basic and fringe benefits which are provided by Wright State University shall remain current and in full force throughout a professional leave, except that any fringe benefit provided by another source during the period of leave shall release Wright State University from the obligation of providing the similar benefit. Eligibility for salary increments and promotion are also continued. A faculty member on leave will not be required to participate in university activities.

~~No professional leave shall be granted that requires a compensating addition to the~~ **non-bargaining** ~~faculty of the university.~~

Attachment G

Proposed Graduate TEFL Certificate Overview

I. Program

Graduate Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) Certificate, College of Liberal Arts, Department of English Language & Literatures

II. Objectives

The TEFL certificate will provide the basic knowledge and skills necessary to teach English overseas. Unlike the existing Wright State Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) certificate—which primarily addresses teaching English as a second language (ESL) in the U.S.—the TEFL certificate will focus exclusively on English as a foreign language (EFL), addressing the special circumstances and resulting challenges involved in teaching students English in their own home country.

III. Description

The English department offers a certificate program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Four courses and a practicum provide the requisite knowledge in language, theory, culture, and classroom teaching of English abroad.

IV. Admission Requirements

The Graduate TEFL Certificate is open to any one with a bachelor's degree, regardless of undergraduate major and has admission to Graduate Studies non-degree status

V. Program Requirements

Required:

- ♦ ENG 677 Workshop: Workshop in TEFL—*4 hours*

Catalog description: Intensive study of selected special topics or problems to meet the particular needs of participating students. Titles vary.

- ♦ ENG 678 Introduction to Linguistics—*4 hours*

Catalog description: Presents a survey of the scientific study of language and focuses on describing and explaining languages in their natural environment. Includes phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics.

- ♦ ENG 680 Studies in Language and Literacy: TEFL Theory & Culture—*4 hours*

Catalog description: Intensive study of linguistic and/or rhetorical approaches to language. Intended to develop an understanding of language history, structure, theory, pedagogy, and content.

- ♦ ENG 685 Studies in English Education: TEFL Methods and Materials—*4 hours*

Catalog description: Focuses on theoretical issues and practical problems of teaching English at all levels, including the teaching of writing and teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL).

- ♦ ED 660 Practicum in English Education: TESOL—*4 hours*

Catalog description: Students are assigned to an instructional class that focuses on the teaching of English to speaker of other languages (TESOL) for a supervised practicum experience. Graded pass/unsatisfactory.

- ♦ Exit Portfolio (see Appendix I)

Total hours: 20

VI. Program Quality

Although 20 hours is a considerable course load for one quarter, since the courses will be coordinated and will reinforce each other, students should be able to complete these courses successfully. The four courses and practicum will address the needs of teachers in an English as a foreign language (EFL) environment and surpass in breadth and depth the vast majority of such a credential offered elsewhere.

VII. Student Performance

Students must maintain a 3.0 or better in the TEFL course work and receive a grade of pass in the practicum in order to receive the TEFL certificate.

VIII. Curriculum Coordination

The Department of English Language and Literatures regularly offers the four courses in the TEFL certificate and will be covered by fulltime faculty currently teaching in the department (see Appendix II). The practicum

is offered by the College of Education and Human Services every quarter.

IX. Resource Coordination

Since the TEFL certificate involves no new courses and will use resources currently available for the other TESOL programs—the TESOL certificate, the MA in TESOL, the TESOL endorsement, and the TESOL emphasis in the undergraduate English major—no additional resources will be required (see Appendix II).

X. Program Staffing

Full-time TESOL Graduate Faculty:

Dr. Deborah Crusan, Assistant Professor of English

Dr. Chris Hall, Associate Professor of English

Dr. Marguerite MacDonald, Associate Professor of English

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Monday, March 3, 2003

Minutes reviewed by University Faculty President James Sayer and University Registrar, Dave Sauter. Prepared by the Registrar's Office.

I. Call to Order:

University Faculty President James Sayer called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in E156 Student Union. The Faculty Senate meetings are broadcast via videoconference to Lake Campus.

Senators: (those present in **bold**) **Bud Baker**, Marjorie Baker, **Carol Endres in for Joe Coleman**, **Gerald Crites**, **Donna Curry**, James Dobbins, **Jack Dustin**, **Kim Goldenberg**, **Mel Goldfinger**, **David Goldstein**, **Ramana Grandhi**, **Maggie Houston**, **Elton Kerr**, **Jeanne Lemkau**, Jackson Leung, **Jill Lindsey**, **Audrey McGowin**, **Ron Kremer**, **Perry Moore**, **Mari O'Brien**, **Drew Pringle**, **Blair Rowley**, **Ed Rutter**, **James Sayer**, **Cathy Sayer**, **Michael Steffan**, **Dan Voss**, **Gordon Walbroehl**, **Mary Wenning**, Norma Wilcox, **Mitch Wolff**. Parliamentarian: **Tom Sav**

II. Approval of the Minutes:

- The minutes of the February 3, 2003, meeting were approved as written (Attachment H to agenda). Located @ (<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/minutes/Feb3SenMin.html>)

III. Report of the President

- Provost search committee will be meeting within the week and making recommendations on those interviewed.
- Strategic Planning committee continues to meet and shape their work product based on input from colleges and divisions.
- State budget discussions with legislators in the house and senate will be informed by business leaders and alumni. This will be the first time universities involve concerned citizens in the process.
- Question from Senator Goldfinger regarding proposed OBR budget cuts, and the "Net Current expenses". President Goldenberg responded regarding the "Fiscal Watch Analysis" performed by the Ohio Board of Regents to track the financial health of public colleges and universities. This analysis is very important because reserves are needed to protect the institution and the people in it. State law now requires a system that both evaluates and penalizes institutions that do not have that kind of reserve. The Fiscal Watch Analysis has changed from one year to the next because the accounting systems have changed. Matt Filipic also responded. What you see there is not a separate fund, it is simply the difference between current revenues on the one hand and current fund expenditures and mandatory transfers (debt service payments including principle and interest on outstanding university debt) on the other. Some of that money is transferred into plant funds and used for various capital projects on campus (i.e. –Union Market Renovation). Dr. Filipic noted that because of new accounting standards this number will be defined differently in the future. In the past it has been a good measure of operating budget performance but comparable numbers will simply be called "changes in net assets" in fiscal 2002 and later years. This number will reflect both the results of operations and the net result of capital investments and depreciation. It will be more difficult to interpret. Dr. Sayer's question to Dr. Filipic as to what news we would be getting from Columbus. The results announced at a press conference by the Governor was a cut occurring this week. It is 2.5% of the state share of instruction formula allocation, which amounts to 1.9 million for WSU

including Lake Campus. That is part of a larger cut that will include K-12 and post-secondary. The failure of the legislature to adopt a sin tax as the Governor proposed or any alternative source of new revenue may also effect us in the coming biennial budget, since the executive budget proposal assumed that the state would be receiving \$700 million from a continuation of those sin taxes to help finance proposed spending in the next two years.

IV. Provost:

- No report

V. Report of the Senate Executive Committee: James Sayer

- Executive Committee of the Senate will meet on March 10, 2003 at 3PM in the Faculty Office, 138 Fawcett Hall, to prepare the agenda for the April meeting. We will have a number of items that are currently New Business that may carry over into April's meeting.

VI. Standing Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment A)

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer, Chair
 - The Faculty Budget Priority Committee met on Monday, February 24, 2003, with all members present except Dr. Yen and Mr. Sav, who had a conflicting UCAP meeting.
 - As charged by the committee at its previous meeting the committee chair had drafted a document dealing with the issue of adjunct usage at WSU, including proposed recommendations for adjunct usage in the future. The meeting focused upon that document, with the members offering numerous suggestions for modifications. The chair will now revise the document based upon those suggestions, and the next meeting will focus upon those revisions. The goal is to complete this document for Senate consideration spring quarter 2003.
- B. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres, Chair
 - See report - additional comment by Professor Endres regarding errors found in the non bargaining unit reports initially submitted from Human Resources. She has corrected these numbers in the reports submitted today.
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav, Chair
 - See report – Dr. Sayer suggested that all take a look at the UCAP links and print up for advising purposes.
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon, Chair
 - No report
- E. Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen, Chair
 - See report
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham, Chair
 - No report – Two significant items to come: 1. Bookstore issues on ordering books and the pricing. 2. Looking into the advisability of credit card solicitors on campus.
- G. Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin, Chair
 - See report regarding the petitions submitted during the January 17, 2002 ,to January 10, 2003. Generally, approximately two-thirds are approved as submitted. Discussion focused upon issues such as the segment involving student errors in dropping, misunderstanding dropping class, etc. The key is student documentation of the petition, and without documentation petitions are not reviewed.

VII. Council Reports

- A. Graduate Council: Jay Thomas (report distributed at the meeting.) Highlights included RSCOB change from 3 to 4 credit hour base; New Department of English Languages and Literature – Graduate

Certificate for Teaching English as a Foreign Language will be proposed to move to old business today. Research Council Research Incentive Program is in process and results should be out in April. Questions from Senator Houston regarding whether scholarships will be reduced about 20% depending on the funds available.

- B. Athletic Council: Drew Pringle. See report. A new Ad hoc committee to be known as the Student Athlete Welfare Committee will be created. The role of the committee is to address the issues that the NCAA has determined need to be addressed outside of the athletic department itself, primarily issues such as exit interviews. Currently undergoing NCAA certification with Mark Mamrack as the Senate representative; any issues or concerns relating to that can be addressed to him.

VIII. Old Business:

- A. Commencement Committee Honorary Degrees – Barbara Denison (Attachment C).

Motion to remove from the table for discussion was approved.

Change in jargon of the “terms of Commencement Committee members” paragraph per Professor Denison’s modest change was approved and seconded. Senator Goldfinger asked why the list be given to the President, and not directly to the Board of Trustees, to which President Sayer responded that all degree nominations are recommended by faculty to the Board through the President.

Regarding an appeal process, none exists currently; Senator Goldfinger was encouraged to submit a proposal. Proposal approved.

- B. GE Course Additions – Ed Rutter

Area II (Non-Western World) and Area VI (COLA)

CST 242-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Music

CST 243-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Art

RST 271-4 Regional Studies: Africa

Area VI (COLA)

TH 250-4 Script Analysis

CLS 260-4 Mythology

Senator Rutter commented that these all meet the requirements, and that CLS 260 had been omitted by error of the committee. Proposals approved.

- C. Transfer Module – Ed Rutter

(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/wsuge03/senate/tmodule.pdf>)

Senator Rutter commented that OBR requires all public instructions to have a Transfer Module, for applicability among institutions regarding student mobility. Regarding Senator Bud Baker’s question regarding FIN 205, Senator Rutter shared that although some courses would not meet OBR guidelines, per the recommendation of Charles Long, Director of Adult and Transfer Students, they would count for Area IV. Senator Rutter wished to thank Charles for his extensive work. Proposal Approved.

- D. CECS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav

(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cecs2003.pdf>) Approved

- E. COLA Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav

(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cola2003.pdf>) Approved

- F. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Certificate Proposal Undergraduate and Graduate –

Tom Sav (Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/teflcert.pdf>)

Motion to move the Graduate Certificate, new business item E, and suspend rules to consider as old business approved. President Sayer asked that Professor Sav discuss both proposals simultaneously. Question regarding the cross-listed status answered by Dr. Limouze. The courses are cross-listed with more extensive portfolio requirement for graduate students. Approved both.

G. Minor in Criminal Justice Proposal – Tom Sav

(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/justice.pdf>). Approved

H. Salary Inequity Appeals Process (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment D)

Dr. Rickert spoke to the Senate at the request of Senior Vice President/Provost Moore regarding all three issues involving NBUF.

- It is essential that the rights of non-bargaining unit faculty before collective bargaining continue. Collective bargaining should have no negative effect on the rights of those faculty who are not represented by the WSU AAUP. The documents submitted impose a number of things about how the university is going to give raises , do annual evaluations, termination issues for people who are on fixed contracts. (i.e. – we can't terminate a visiting assistant professor or and instructor who has an abbreviated term contract, setting criteria for evaluations etc.) Some of the issues raised need to be evaluated because it requires the university to commit in advance to exactly what kind of raises we're going to have etc. There has been no discussion with the Provost office regarding these changes.
- Questions regarding who NBUF covers, and needs to be clarified.
- Questions regarding SOM and SOPP require those faculty to speak on their behalf..
- Asked that the Office of the Provost be consulted regarding the issues, as they have not been involved up to this point. Revisions need to be made to fit instructors and lecturers as well as other faculty

Discussion: Professor Endres commented that for the salary inequity portion nothing has been added other than what is already out. What specifically are the difficulties? Bargaining is defined for faculty not administrators. For that reason Chairs are included but nobody above. It seems the chairs are the ones that fall into both categories.

There had been discussions with the SOM & SOPP to make changes to fit the their needs.

President Sayer commented that the Senate can review the documents and move as they see fit.

He asked that Drs. Rickert and Endres (and NBUF Committee) meet to talk through the issues.

This would require that Items H-J be removed from the table. Professor Endres agreed; Dr.

Rickert agreed as well, and commented that the discussion is not so much with agreeing with the issues, but with the wording. The issue of who should be left out of was raised. Chairs should be excluded from salary inequity appeals; if they need more money they approach the Dean. Vice President Moore commented that separating the various groups and proceeding with separate processes would be the appropriate route. He proposed that the professional schools could suggest that an appeals committee be created. Senator Rutter moved to table H, I and J, pending discussion between NBUF and Provost office, needs of instructors, lecturers, clinical faculty in CONH, constitutional issues, etc. Senator McGowin commented that the term of “non-bargaining unit faculty” be dropped from the jargon.

Motioned and seconded for proposal to table. Approved.

I. Due Process Mechanism (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment E)

Motioned and seconded for proposal to table. Approved.

J. Professional Development Leave (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment F)

Motioned and seconded for proposal to table. Approved.

IX. New Business (A suspension of the rules will be requested to move these items to Old Business.)

Motioned and approved to put on agenda A, B, C, D as old business for catalog needs. Motion to suspend rules approved.

A. CONH Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav Approved as old business.

(Details @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/conh2003.pdf>)

B. COSM Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav

(Details will be posted February 27 @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cosm2003.pdf>)

Some are under review and more. Professor Sav commented that the licensure programs are

potentially not completely worked out and so suggested that these not be approved. Senator Lindsey added that the licensure programs may not meet the state and national requirements. Recommended that senate NOT move on those licensure programs. However, Professor Sav added that within a couple of weeks the affected colleges (since state must ultimately approve) must work out differences. Senator Rutter felt that the COSM changes have not gone through their curriculum committee review. Senator Houston commented that the senators be polled via email once changes have been generated from the colleges and through March 17 UCAPC; however, there is no Senate provision for proxy voting or email voting.

Motioned and seconded to table item B. Approved.

C. CEHS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav. Approved as old business.

(Details will be posted February 27 @ <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cehs2003.pdf>)

D. General Education Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav. Approved as old business.

Biology 105, 106, 107 Sequence Substitutions

Current: BIO 112, 114, 115

New: BIO 111, 112, 115

Music 214 Substitution

Current: MUS 121

New: MUS 121 and 122

E. Graduate Certificate TEFL – Joe Coleman (Attachment G) Approved as old business.

F. Guidelines for Implementing WSU GE Transfer Policy (for old business next month)

X. Announcements:

A. Nominations for Faculty President-Elect (2004-05) are currently being accepted through Friday, April 4, 2003. The following is applicable via Provost Memorandum No. 82-3, May 1, 1982.

B. Next Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, April 7, 2003, 2:30 p.m., 156 Student Union.

XI. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.